

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-7750

NATHANIEL ADEL STEWART-BEY, a/k/a Nathaniel
Adel Stewart,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION; B. A.
BLEDSON,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western
District of Virginia, at Roanoke. Samuel G. Wilson, District
Judge. (CA-04-447-7-SGW)

Submitted: April 14, 2005

Decided: April 19, 2005

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Nathaniel Adel Stewart-Bey, Appellant Pro Se. John Leslie
Brownlee, United States Attorney, Roanoke, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Nathaniel Adel Stewart-Bey, convicted and sentenced in the superior court of the District of Columbia and now incarcerated in Virginia, seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his petition filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (2000), challenging the revocation of his parole by the United States Parole Commission. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000); see Madley v. United States Parole Comm'n, 278 F.3d 1306, 1310 (D.C. Cir. 2002). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Stewart-Bey has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED